

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 5 October, 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made by the Examiner, Claim 1 has now been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 2, now cancelled. Claims 3-16 have also been amended to correct and/or improve grammar, syntax and clarity. No new matter has been introduced

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and not claiming the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Martin (U.S. 5,967,801). Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Wolfel (U.S. 4,431,246). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious in view of Wolfel when taken in combination with Vaden (U.S. 4,431,246). Claims 8-11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Wolfel when taken in combination with Martin. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Wolfel.

The Examiner has graciously indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form so as to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 2 has been merged into currently amended Claim 1; the original claim 2 has now been cancelled. It is Applicant's belief that currently amended Claim 1 now further teaches and claims the plug RG having a buckling portion disposed on a side in the receiving cavity, and the buckling portion is capable of being pressed on the orientation member of the connection member. By including the limitations of the allowable Claim 2, currently amended Claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct from the prior art. Insofar as all of the other claims depend

Application 10/781,770  
MR1957-854  
Response to Office Action of 10/5/04

directly or indirectly on Claim 1, it is further believed that all of the claims thus overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections by incorporating by reference the limitations of currently amended and patentably distinct independent Claim 1.

Applicant is of the belief that the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner in the 5 October 2004 office action have all been addressed and overcome by the currently amended claims and remarks. It is now further believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
(For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Harry Sernaker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Harry" and last name "Sernaker" clearly distinguishable.

Harry Sernaker  
Registration #50,595  
Dated: 12-28-2004

Suite #101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678